

REMARKS

Claims 1-29 are pending in the above-identified application. Claims 1-29 were rejected. With this Amendment, claim 15 was amended, and no claims were added or canceled cancelled. Accordingly, claims 1-29 are at issue.

I. 35 U.S.C. § 101 Subject Matter Rejection of Claims

Claims 15-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101, as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection is moot in view of the present amendments.

II. 35 U.S.C. § 102 Anticipation Rejection of Claims

Claims 1-29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Devine et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0095399, hereinafter “*Devine*”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Devine fails to teach every limitation of claim 1. For example, *Devine* fails to teach both “obtaining information describing a datatype to be registered, the datatype having a metadata that describes a data and a reference to the data, *the data being maintained separately from the datatype*” (emphasis added). Applicant reiterates the argument presented in the previous Amendment “A” that, with respect to the first italicized clause, the Examiner construes a “file” in paragraph 390 of *Devine* to be the “datatype” of claim 1. Whereas, with respect to the second italicized clause, the Examiner construes a “delivered service output” in paragraph 384 of *Devine* to be the “datatype” of claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits that this reasoning is inconsistent

and illogical. To advance prosecution and clarify the record for appeal, the Examiner is respectfully requested to explain this inconsistency or else select one construction of the claims, in the next communication from the Office.

Moreover, neither a file nor a service output can be construed as a "datatype" in view of a reasonable interpretation of the specification or even the common meaning of the word "datatype." For example, a file or service output may have a datatype, but neither are, in themselves, datatypes. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that *Devine* fails to teach every limitation of claim 1, and therefore the rejection of claim 1 is erroneous and should be withdrawn. Claims 15 and 29 are patentable for at least the same reasons as given for claim 1. All remaining claims are patentable for at least the same reasons as their independent base claims.

III. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that all claims are allowable over the cited prior art, and respectfully requests favorable notification to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: February 22, 2007

By: _____

A. Wesley Ferrebee
Registration No. 51,312
SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
P.O. Box 061080
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080
(312) 876-8000
Customer No. 58328